

CHAPTER 4

WORD IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

4.1. The word and concept: methods of analysis

The formation of anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics at the turn of the millennium has raised awareness of the role of human factor in language and led to the transition to understand linguistic phenomena not only as a means of communication or expression, but also as a tool of cognition. The need for deeper penetration into the mentality of the ethnic group, the study of language and speech in the broader context of culture, society, history caused the formation of cognitive linguistics as one of the integral priority directions of modern linguistic research.

An important place among the problems of cognitive science is the correlation of the concept with a tangent to it concepts and features of its objectification in language, the study of which is devoted this section. Cognitive linguistics is characteristic of the complexity in the interpretation of the concept that gives the opportunity to consider it in a broad interdisciplinary context, in conjunction with the correlated concepts, primarily with the word. Problems of differentiation of the concept and notion (the meaning of words, images, etc.), semantic and conceptual analyses were considered by the majority of both domestic and foreign linguists and researchers of conceptual unit, among them N. Arutyunova, A. Vezhbitskaya, S. Vorkachev, K. Goloborodko, I. Golubovska, S. Jabotinska, V. Zhayvoronok, O. Zalevskaya, L. Ivanova, V. Ivanenko, V. Karasik, T. Kosmeda, V. Kononenko, Krasnobaeva-Chorna, U. Karpenko, O. Kubryakova, John Lakoff, E. Lissan, A. Malenko, V. Maslova, T. Radzievskaya, E. Roche, M. Pimenova, Z. Popova, O. Selivanova, M. Skab, N. Sluhay, V. Starko, Y. Stepanov, Y. Sternin, R. Frumkina, L. Cherneyko, etc. [Vilchynska 2008].

O. Kubryakova indicates to the ambiguity of the terminology of cognitive science, noting that it is necessary if not to overcome then at least to specify in each case [Kubryakova 1996, p. 95]. Most of the terms, according to A. Vezhbitskaya, are mostly uncertain or definitions are not met, so really «real analysis is performed on

the basis of intuition and common sense» [Vezhbitskaja 1999, p. 75]. Therefore, to know the nature of the concept, outline its specificity, it is necessary to see how this period is compared with other ones, related, in particular with word.

Mostly they associate with the word expression of the concept in the language, where it acquires the status of a name the concept of the linguistic sign that most fully and adequately objectifies the conceptual sense. As noted by S. Vorkachev, «the relationship of the concept with verbal means of expression is spoken almost in all definitions of the concept, but there aren't the unity of opinion regarding specific meaningful units of language with which it is correlated in linguoconceptology» [Vorkachev 2001, p. 68]. Getting the status of the name of the concept, it is most fully and adequately describes its content. If the concept is reality, then the concept is not only the proximity of the subject, subject meaning, but the word is the name of realities, the word-sign as some intellectually meaningful essence or character sense. Other linguists rightly believe that the main units of expression of the concept is the word and the phrase (M. Alefirenko, Y. Stepanov), some linguists add the sentence to here (K. Goloborodko, O. Kubryakova). A lot of researchers also classifies phraseological units to the means of verbalization (M. Boldyrev, V. Kononenko, N. Mekh). Some linguists name word family among verbalizers (V. Levitsky, M. Skab).

The relationship between the concept and word in general was under examination of many scientists (M. Alefirenko, S. Vorkachev, L. Grusberg, V. Levitsky, N. Mekh, M. Skab etc.). M. Alefirenko considers the word and phrase as basic forms of expression of the concept [Alefirenko 2005, p. 59]. «The concept can be verbalized by single words and phrases, phraseologic units, sentences and entire texts», – says N. Mekh [Mekh 2005, p. 21]. Moreover, the concept is dynamic, and the word is static, it activates the emergence of the concept.

According to opinions of Z. Popova and Y. Sternin, it would be wrong to say «concept tree» or «concept of tree», more appropriate are formulations: concept, presented in the language by the word *tree*, represented in the language system by the word *tree*, verbalized by the word *tree* etc. [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 41]. Researchers

compare the word with the switch that «includes» the concept in our minds, activating and «launching» it in the process of thinking [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 79].

M. Skab, citing S. Vorkachev, notes that in general «concept could be correlated with the root morpheme, which is the basis of word family, but then it will remain without a name» [Skab 2008, p. 28].

With an emphasis on the relationships of the concept and the word, V. Zhayvoronok, S. Nikitina, L. Sinelnikova even use the term «word-concept». «A concept is a cognitive structure covered by the linguistic sign», – says L. Sinelnikova, who in his writings often uses the term «word-concept» [Sinel'nikova 2005, p. 12]. This term is used too by V. Zhayvoronok, defining it as «a repository of the generalized cultural meaning (sense), which gives grounds to consider the language unit of cultural concept». Referring to S. Bulgakov, the scientist develops the idea this way: «thus, the concept at the same time and form the concept, and the idea embodied in the verbal imagery of genesis. In other words, the word as the name of realities together with the whole set of characteristic of linguistic signs is not only linguistic, but also conceptual entity, the concept» [Zhaivoronok 2007, p. 10–11]. At the same time, the linguist appeals to the term «word mark» as «some intellectually meaningful entity, as the substance of meaningful, or mark sense», which considers one of the essential distinctive characteristic of the concept [Zhaivoronok 2004, p. 25].

According to L. Buyanova, the ratio of the concept – the word is a priority in the attempts of structuring of the different conceptual spheres [Bujanova].

L. Grusberg, on the contrary, points to some differences between the concept and the word: 1) the inner content of the word is its semantics, plus the connotations (i.e. the combination of semes and lexical-semantic variants plus expressive / emotional / stylistic coloration, estimation criterion etc.), and the internal content of a concept is a kind of set of meanings, which is significantly different from semes structuring and lexico-semantic variants of the word; 2) concept characterizes antinomy, where as antinomy author traditionally understands the combination of the two mutually contradicting judgments about the same object, each of which is true

concerning this object and each of which admits equally convincing grounds; 3) in the formation of concepts the role of subjective principle that is uncharacteristic for the word is very significant; the subjective factor is one of the pulses of the change (motion) of the concept and leads to greater dynamism in comparison with the word [Gruzberg 2002, p. 58–60].

It is necessary to point out that, despite the linguistic (verbal) expression of concepts, scientists usually interpret their semantics not as a lexical meaning, a somewhat broader: semantics of the word concept covers the whole range of extralinguistic meanings acquired as a result of the collective experience of mankind [Sinelnikova 2005, p. 12]. Concepts associate semantic features of the verbal sign system, traditions and spiritual values of the people [Manakin 2004, p. 27]. Such thoughts at the time were expressed by O. Potebnya, the interpretation of the concept in his works is beyond the «pure logic» and is associated with features of «national spirit» and in correlation with the word, is not identified with it [Potebnja 1999, p. 37].

Recognizing the concept of the content of the linguistic sign, S. Vorkachev includes in the semantic sphere of it the entire communicative significant information: paradigmatic, syntagmatic and derivational connections; pragmatic information, due to the expressive and locative functions; and also the cognitive memory of words and semantic features of the linguistic sign related to the system of spiritual values of native speakers [Vorkachev 2001, p. 66]. At the same time, despite the fact that the word element of the lexical-semantic system is implemented within the relevant paradigm, is correlated with several lexical units, S. Vorkachev concludes that the concept is also correlated with the plan of expression of lexical-semantic paradigm is in fact lexical, phraseologic, aphoristic means [Vorkachev 2001, p. 68]. Thus, the concept is thought of wider than the word that is its name, it can be expressed in words-synonyms, showing the proximity significantly field words-of the nominees, and other language tools, which in turn makes it possible to study it in context. «The name of the concept is not the only character that can activate a concept in the human mind, and the more diverse the potential for iconic

expression of the concept, the higher its value meaning within a linguistic community» [Slyshkin 2000, p. 17].

The study also inclined to believe that the word is only one of the language representatives of the concept, and therefore it shouldn't be equated the concept and the word.

The nature of verbalization of the concept that getting to express the system of linguistic signs becomes part of semantic space of language, was studied by M. Zhinkin, which used the concept of universal subject code as a scheme, which is a semiotic transformation of the subject of the category [Zhinkin 1964].

Practically all linguistic and cultural definitions contain suggestion to the relationship of the concept with verbal means of expression, in which it is interpreted as: «image of full meaning (significative) that reflects a fragment of the national picture of the world, generalized in the word» (V. Neroznak); «perfect, representing the unity of speech – thought» (O. Snytko); «any discrete unit of collective consciousness, reflecting the subject of the real or the ideal world in the national memory in the verbal language indicated by the form» (A. Babushkin) [cit. Vorkachev 2001, p. 68].

The idea, according to which the concept can be associated not only with a particular word, but also with its individual vocabulary value is also widespread in linguistics. Based on the teachings of S. Askold, developed by D. Likhachev in the article «Conceptual sphere of Russian language». The author argues that «the concept does not exist for the word, and for each primary (dictionary) meaning of the word separately», and it is not directly arise from the meaning of the word, «but is the result of a collision of dictionary meaning of the word with personal and national experience» [Likhachev 1993, p. 4]. This implies that the concept can relate only to the individual lexico-semantic variant of polysemantic word. Which of the dictionary meanings of words replaces a concept, usually it becomes clear from the context, and sometimes even from the general situation. And the word, its meaning, and also concepts of these meanings necessarily exist in the corresponding human «ideoshere» due to the individual's experience, acquired knowledge and skills, and etc.

To comprehend the meaning of the concept, according to A. Vezhbitskaya, «we can only through words (no one has yet invented another way)» [Vezhbitskaja 1999, p. 293]. According to Y. Stepanov, there are no abstract spiritual concepts in the culture: they are expressed by word or material object [Stepanov 2004, p. 75]. Most concepts are expressed verbally, «which creates the illusion of ease of the meaning understanding» [Frumkina 1992, p. 168].

So, although mostly the expression of the concept in language is associated with the lexeme, which gets the status of the name of the concept, of the linguistic sign that most fully and adequately objectifies the conceptual sense, however, the name of the concept is not the only sign that can be activated in human consciousness.

Issue of language objectification of concepts is one of relevant in cognitive linguistics. This problem was discussed in the work of such scientists as A. Vezhbitskaya, A. Zadorozhnaya, V. Zusman, L. Kompantseva, T. Kosmeda, M. Pimenova, V. Starko, Y. Stepanov, T. Romanova etc. While they distinguished between verbal (verbal, linguistic) and nonverbal (gestures, movements, etc.) concepts (V. Zusman), the direct and indirect means of language representation (A. Vezhbizkaya) or focused attention on a single verbalizer (N. Arutyunova, S. Vorkachev, V. Zhayvoronok) or on the totality of language means as «the verbal equivalent of the concept» (T. Romanova, V. Starko).

According to V. Karasik, the concept can be expressed using the set of linguistic and non-linguistic means, which directly or indirectly specify and develop its content [Karasik 2004, p. 110]. Direct and indirect verbalizers of the concept are distinguished by A. Vezhbizkaya. Under the direct ones he understands «vocabulary family», the words, the etymology of which can be reduced to a key-lexeme of the concept, and the indirect ones, according to her opinion, include collocation, grammatical features of lexical items and other information from which we can deduce the characteristics of the concept [Vezhbitskaja 1997, p. 92]. In studies of Ukrainian language the similar thought was expressed by V. Kononenko, noting: «Around the words for a concept, and related word-concepts a semantic field is created, the maximum and sufficient context within which numerous conotation

supports, additional values, associative and evaluation ranks are identified» [Kononenko 2004, p.19].

According to M. Pimenova, the concept is creation, «sprayed in language signs that objectify it», so to recreate its structure it is necessary to explore the entire language corpus, by which it is represented (lexical and phraseological units, paremii fund and etc.) including a system of sustainable comparisons, depicting images of standard, specific for some language [Pimenova 2004, p. 9].

Trying to unify the knowledge of the verbalizers of the concept, many scholars significantly expand the understanding of them. In particular, they consider among those units synonyms, antonyms, typical syntactic position, collocation, semantic fields, metaphor, idioms, and language patterns, and similar [Arutjunova 1994, p. 3] or notice that verbalized concept «is expressed by lexical, phraseological, paremiological units, precedent texts, etiquette formulas and tactics of verbal behavior» [Rudakova 2007, p. 17]. V. Starko among verbalizers of the concept name also the etymology of words that expresses a particular concept, as well as evaluation, figurative associations [Starko 2004, p.5].

L. Lysychenko, T. Kovaleva, A. Ufimtseva, G. Schur are considering the different semantic units (lexical-semantic and lexico-grammatical groups, thematic group, lexical-semantic and phraseological fields or paradigms, etc.), characterized by the closeness of the meanings, themes, sphere of use, but differ in certain characteristics as language verbalizers of the concept.

As you can see, the concept is verbalized in language by multilevel means: lexical and phraseological units, structural and positional diagrams of sentences, texts and sets of texts. V. Maslova draws attention that concept has a certain determinate semantic values of the form, which is characterized by ethno-cultural determinism because «it reflects all conotation, modal, emotional, expressive, pragmatic and other assessments, all the individual, peculiar to that language» [Maslova 2004, p. 35].

In recent times for the terminology identification of the totality of linguistic resources, that objectify(verbally represent) the concept, they use term combination «nominative field», the doctrine that is fully covered in the textbook of Z. Popova

and Y. Sternin «Cognitive linguistics». We have to note that the term «field» is often used non-differentially along such terms as «lexical-semantic group» or «thematic group». They distinguish between lexical, grammatical, syntagmatic, associative and other fields. Under the nominative field of the concept is usually understood «the totality of linguistic resources which objectify (verbally represent) the concept in a certain period of development of society» [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 66], noting that it includes units of different parts of speech and differs from the traditional stratification of the lexical system of national languages – a lexical-semantic group, lexical-semantic fields, lexico-phraseological field, synonymous rank, associative field by that it is complex and covers all of these types of structures [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 66].

For Z. Popova and Y. Sternin, nominative field of the concept includes: direct nominations of the concept, who serve as his name, and the system synonyms, derived from the primary representative name; general radical, derivative associated with the core verbalizers of the concept; contextual synonyms and occasional individual author's nominations; set expressions of words and phraseological units in the broadest sense (phrases, premii, aphorisms, etc.); free word combinations in which certain attributes of the concept are objectified; metaphorical nominations and subjective verbal definitions, as well as various lexicographic interpretations of verbalizers of the concept in encyclopedias, dictionaries, linguistic dictionaries; thematic scientific or popular scientific, artistic and publicistic texts; set of texts; associative fields [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 69-71]. You can also add syntactic units, which as verbalizers of the concept are still insufficiently studied.

According to M. Slobodian: «Nominative field of the concept includes the direct category (the keyword and its synonyms), the nominations of species of the concept denotation, the associative field of keywords-representative of the concept (expressing the characteristics that belong to the core of the concept) and set expressions-comparisons, phraseological units and paremii (we refer to the periphery of the concept content). The construction of the nominative field of the concept is based on the use of lexicographical sources (thesaurus, synonyms, explanatory,

phraseological dictionaries), and subjective experience of the researcher and, if necessary, the data of associative experiment held among the native speakers» [Slobodian 2009, p. 109]. So, the nominative field of the concept is built primarily by continuous sampling from the dictionaries of different types and ethnographic sources of direct nominations of the concept, their synonyms, derivatives, and etc.

Besides Z. Popov and Y. Sternin note two approaches by which you can explore nominative field of the concept. The first one involves only the identifying of the direct nominations of the concept and its key representatives and their synonyms, while the second gives you the opportunity to find out all that is available to the researcher [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 177]. According to the scientists the nucleus of the nominative field is the key word, the lexical unit that conveys most fully a concept and the synonyms for them, which are characterized by high frequency, the most common meaning, used in the literal, stylistically neutral, without emotionally expressive and temporal constraints, and minimally dependent upon context. Peripheral components, according to them, are established through analysis of literary and journalistic texts, building of the lexical-phraseological fields, associative fields, derivation field of keywords, parameii field, analysis of set expressions-comparisons with nominees of the concept etc. [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 180-186].

V. Karasik, exploring the peculiarities of concepts verbalization, distinguishes three ways of their objectivation: identification, expression, and description. Under the designation scientist understands the assignment to conceptualized notion the concept of a definite name, a special character; under the expression – the totality of linguistic and non-linguistic means of illustrating, clarifying and developing its basic meaning; and description defines as a special research procedure the interpretation of the meaning of the concept name and notes that they can all participate in the formation of the nominative field [Karasik 2004, p. 110-111].

Consequently, the concept as a bundle of specific concepts and ideas obtained by a person throughout his life, is verbalized by various language means that generate its nominative field that is complex and involves different groups of vocabulary, i.e. a

set of categories, and other language units. However, the main means of presentation in language is the word.

The appeal of cognitive linguistics to this object of study, as verbalized information prompted the researchers to determine the specificity of the conceptual and semantic analysis. Although the distinction between semantic and conceptual analysis is not in doubt, scientists often consider conceptual analysis a continuation semantic (T. Romanova, M. Alefirenko, M. Tolstoy, V. Levitsky et al.). In particular, T. Romanova offers under the conceptual analysis to understand «the study of speech (cognitive) content, value (modal) connotations and motivational-pragmatic attitudes expressed in words» [Romanova 2005, p. 23]. Therefore, in description of the concepts in some places the consideration of their linguistic representations is dominated, which can lead to the neglect of any underlying cognitive model and the limits of conceptual analysis description of lingual units, key representatives of the concept. So, for example, M. Alefirenko considers the semantics of the linguistic sign as the main source of knowledge about the contents of the presented concept. Hence the relevant research path – from the semantics of the linguistic sign to the content of the corresponding concept [Alefirenko 2005, p. 183].

At the same time more persuasive is the view that the traditional semantic and conceptual analysis are still different research objects and different tasks: if the semantic analysis is associated with the interpretation of the meaning of the word, the conceptual concept is aimed at knowledge of the world, «any view is naive, scientific, experienced and even false that in the aggregate components presents the concept» [Kononenko 2008, p. 113].

According to O. Kubryakova, semantic analysis focuses on the explication of the semantic structure of a word, that is, its denotative, significative and connotative meanings, and conceptual meaning involves the search for general concepts, summed up under the single sign [Kubryakova 1991, p. 85].

The researchers note several distinguished features of these two types of analysis. So, the semantic analysis is characterized by: the iconic representation, the linearity, the explanatory character of the word. But the conceptual analysis is

characterized by: mental abstraction, specificity, relational model form and focus on the field of knowledge. If conceptual analysis is based on the verbalization of a certain part of knowledge and can therefore represent their specific structure (pattern schemes, pictures representations), the semantic analysis is able to acquire the character of nonlinear modeling. Therefore, the main difference between both types of analysis it is advisable to consider the direction of modeling: from knowledge to the characters – for conceptual analysis and from signs to knowledge for the semantic one [Selivanova 2006, p. 262].

In addition, semantic analysis involves consideration of all meanings of the word in its relationship with other lexemes, whereas the conceptual one has as a object to establish the meaning encompassed by words, categories, more broadly speaking, knowledge. Thus «conceptual analysis involves the integration of concepts of different cognitive categories of objectivity, designation and processuality, the occurrence of the name in predicate environment is the determining factor of the description and the name of the concept» [Kononenko 2004, p. 6–7].

Often the scientists attribute the difference between semantic and conceptual analyses with the difference between meaning and concept. So, E. Lassen interprets the meaning as the knowledge about the conditions of use of the word for the naming of a certain reference situation and transfer it to the listener with the aim of dialogical interaction with him, and the concept is the knowledge about an entity formed as a consequence of considerations (autocommunications) over the corresponding reference that were transmitted with the aim of realizing its own purposes and impact on the setting of the addressee. Based on this, the researcher sees the purpose of semantic analysis in establishing the structure of lexical meaning on the basis of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations of lexemes. In contrast, the conceptual analysis considers, aimed at identifying the estimated attitude of the media culture to situation denoted by lexeme through the analysis of discourses and the ratio of a phenomenon that cannot be observed directly, with the phenomena of the level of reality that can be perceived sensually [Lassan 2002, p. 12].

The relation between semantic and conceptual analyses is considered by L. Cherneyko. According to L. Cherneyko, there are different kind of analysis, although they are interrelated: the result of conceptual analysis is to identify gestalts – associative contours of word that are typical for native speakers of a certain culture, which can be deduced from the compatibility of the metaphorical name of the concept [Chernejko 1995, p. 74]. We have to note that when L. Cherneyko presents the results of conceptual analysis in the form of gestalts, E. Lassan describes the conceptual content of the name in the language of semantic primitives [Lassan 2002].

Feature of conceptual analysis, according to V. Starko, is that it involves going beyond linguistic material. Language data remain central, but the explication of various concepts attract extralinguistic representatives of the concept, ethnic and cultural information, and etc. In addition, under this analysis a claim of psychological validity of the research constructs, according to which the latter must not only be consistent with the array of the exponents of the concept, but subject to principles of functioning of the human psyche [Starko 2007, p. 38].

At the same time, scientists note that the analysis of the concept rely on the contexts of very different plan than semantic analysis. The word realizes itself in speech contexts, the concept is forming in the «culture texts» and sources of information for understanding the concepts serve as precedent texts, particularly 3roverbs, sayings, aphorisms, set expressions of words, names of famous works of spiritual culture, the common scientific theories, etc.; art definitions and concepts developed in a particular work... [Gruzberg 2002, p. 58].

The close connection of the concept with associative space name that is thought of as a form of semantic networks that exist in the mind, allows, according to O. Selivanova, complement conceptual analysis, in contrast to the semantic, experimental methods – associative and receptionin experiment [Selivanova, 2000, p. 140].

So, the new trend in linguistics at the turn of the millennium has intensified and new methods of research, in particular scientific interest in conceptual analysis as a kind of linguistic. That is the conceptual analysis allows to reveal the specificity of

verbalization of the concept in the language world picture of an ethnic group, to describe the mechanisms of selection of lexical, phraseological, grammatical and other means of representation of different ethnocultural concepts in language, to establish the relationship between concept and word etc.

«Conceptual analysis is now becoming the leading method of research in social sciences – cognitive science, philosophy, linguistics, genderology, cultural studies, theories of intercultural communication, sociology, psychology», – says L. Kompantseva [Kompanceva 2005, p. 90]. This similar idea is expanding by O. Kubryakova, noting that «the method of cognitive science is to try to combine the data of different sciences, to harmonize and to find meaning in their relationships» [Kubryakova 1994, p. 35-36]. According to M. Skab, conceptual analysis is, is actively used, they are trying to justify its existence. They think that now there are many varieties of conceptual analysis, or, as they are called, methods, «common to them is that they consider the issue of creating a holistic conception of the relation of language and thought, ways of expressing in the language of order, of reality, of knowledge about the world, the laws of the organization of the language world picture» [Skab 2008, p. 42]. According to the researcher, every scientist fits the conceptual analysis for the study of «own» concept [Skab 2009, p. 6].

There are many methods of conceptual analysis [Slukhai, Snitko, Vilchynska 2011, Skab 2008, Kosmeda 2010], which is often interpreted as a general name for a whole group of linguistic methods for studying the structures of representation of knowledge [Starko 2007, p. 31], however, in the proposed study we will consider primarily those that provide for the establishment of the linguistic means of verbalization of the concept, design study in relations with the word.

So, M. Skab proposes a study of the concept based on analysis of semantic space of the word. The model of semantic space unites the totality of words meanings, which operate in language and speech, and are implemented in all areas of deployment of its semantics, in particular, when extending the semantic structure of the lexemes and the emergence of derivative formations, as well as in connecting properties of the analyzed words [Skab 2006, p. 358]. The researcher believes that

applying this methodology will give an opportunity not only to determine the main, essential and secondary elements of the concept, but also to find out the ethno-cultural component in the semantics of a word that would help identify the language picture of the world.

In the aspect of our study the interest in the methods of the etymological analysis of the concepts first proposed by Y. Stepanov is updated. After installing a language representative of the concept, according to the scientist, you should research the etymology of its name, i.e., the origin of words and how it was created, because the internal form is a fundamental principle, from which other conceptual layers arose and developed [Stepanov 2004, p. 10]. Historical and etymological analysis of the concept reveals the essential characteristics associated with long-standing purpose of the word, that is the name of the concept that refers to the values system of a linguistic community, and expresses the peculiarities of its worldview. Source that helps to explore the concept in diachrony and to establish the mechanism of its formation, are primarily an etymological dictionaries.

The methodology of the structural-semantic analysis of the concepts at the time, was designed by I. Mikhalchuk. He understands the conceptual model «as a way to explicate the semantic structure of the concept». Since such modeling involves identifying of the basic components of the conceptual semantics and the relationships between them, the scientist considers these relations in synchronic and diachronic aspects, which allows us to trace the evolution of the concept [Mihal'chuk 1997, p. 29].

Among the methods of conceptual analysis differs ethnocentricity concept of O. Vezhbytska. According to the researcher, with the participation of a limited set of universal semantic elements can be used to detect the diversity generated by human ideas – concepts that are embodied in lexical units, as well as value orientations that are specific to a particular culture [Vezhbitskaja 2001, p. 3].

S. Nikitina traces the specifics of the conceptual analysis of folk culture, arguing that the semantic description of words, concepts can only be established through determining their links with other concepts of the same culture. Describing the

relationship between such words-concepts, it is possible to obtain a partial interpretation of the words. The sum of all partial interpretations is fairly complete semantic description-an explanation of the word concept. S. Nikitina names this type of conceptual analysis as the «a dissected definition» [Nikitina 1991, p. 118].

Often scientists say that a much larger number of signs of concepts, in comparison with that taken from the dictionary, «can be obtained through the study of lexical combinatory of keyword» [Popova, Sternin 2001, p. 104]. Analyzing the metaphoric compatibility of name of concept that helps to establish the figurative characteristics of the studied phenomenon, deserves special attention (V. Telija, O. Kondratyeva, M. Krasovskii). In particular, V. Telija notices that «it is the study of the combinatory (especially metaphorical) it seems to many linguists the basis of the method of conceptual analysis» [Telija 1991, p. 53]. We have to note that on the basis of the metaphorical combinatory the representatives of the Kemerovo school of linguistics headed by M. Pimenova tested methodology of conceptual analysis, which consists in «in the study of the meaning of the word, which focused not only the signs necessary and sufficient to identify the signified, but also naive knowledge of the signified implemented in metaphors and metonymy» [Pimenova 2007, p.14].

It must be emphasized that, if necessary, by applying certain procedures of conceptual analysis in our study also we take into account the approach that focuses on in-depth study of the evaluation of the concepts sphere, which is defined as a method of semantic-axiological field. On the one hand, it is relevant, especially given the fact that the concept and conceptsphere are characterized by the structuring principle of the field (Z. Popova, Y. Sternin, L. Babenko, V. Maslova, V. Nikolaeva). The benefits of such structuring are associated primarily with the fact that the dialectic of the relationship of linguistic phenomena with extralinguistic reality reveals more fully, the features of lingual consciousness manifest, especially its national-specific features.

The spread of scientific ideas connected with the development of cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics, led to the revision of some traditional concepts and the emergence of new, among which the notion of conceptual fields. It is important to

emphasize that the semantics of the units of that field association is a dialectical unity of language values and order of the sense, and the fields themselves cover certain concepts of history, culture, and literature of a people, peculiarities of his mentality, national character, cognition, psychology [Kononenko 1996, p. 103], thereby forming a complex and specific to each language picture of the world. According to T. Kosmedy, «today, scientists consider the legitimate use of field theory for analysis of the means of the concept verbalization, because the word is the name of the concept» [Kosmeda, Plotnikova 2010, p. 66].

The fact of structuring this field deserves attention, in particular, the selection of two levels: a linguistic level of words and idioms and conceptual level is represented by them lexically semantic and lexically semantic concepts [Goldberg 2001, p. 57]. We will add that the field approach to the content structure of the lexemes significantly expands the idea of semantic volume of words [Popova, Sternin, Beljaeva 1989, p. 7], which is the main language representative of the concept.

On the other hand, concerning the axiological dominant in the title of the proposed method, it just provides a concentration of research attention on different connotative characteristics of the concept, the main of which believe the estimate, since the center of the concept as a central principle of the culture to which it belongs, is always a value (V. Karasik). «If media culture can tell about some phenomenon «it's good (bad, exciting, disappointing, etc.)», this phenomenon generates concept in the appropriate culture» [Miller 2000, p. 42].

Concluding the discussion of conceptual analysis, we note that it differs from the semantic and covers a set of methods, receptions, methods that are able to identify cultural and mental nature of conceptual units primarily because of its relations with the word. Certain elements of this approach are presented in algorithms of conceptual analysis of M. Pimenova (she proposes to examine the lexical meaning and the inner form of the word that nominates the concept; to identify the number of synonymous lexemes; to establish ways of conceptualization as a secondary reinterpretation of the relevant lexemes etc.) [Pimenova 2007, p. 15]; Z. Krasnobaeva-Chorna (she includes definition of the core concept based on the dictionary definitions of the same lexeme

in different historical periods; study of the ideographic structure of the concept; the selection of background information (from different dictionaries: etymological, explanatory, mythological, culturological, ethnolinguistic, and etc.) [Krasnobaieva-Chorna 2009, p. 42]; T. Kosmeda (involves consideration of the basic category of the concept and its synonyms; establishing the etymology of the referent of the sign – the name of the concept; installation of word-formative signs of all noumenon of concept etc.) [Kosmeda, Plotnikova 2010, p. 70-73]; Z. Popova (propose a definition of nominative field of the concept; analysis and description of the semantics of the language means belonging to it, and etc.) [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 195].

Next, we illustrate the use of the above methods and techniques to research of features of language verbalization of the sacral concept «God», first of all, the establishment of the nominative field of the concept, etimological reconstruction of the inner form of the concept names, and their metaphoric compatibility and diversion opportunities.

4.2. Features of verbalization of the sacral concept «God» in the Ukrainian ethnolinguial culture

The presence of a large number of categories of the concept shows «a high nominative density of the fragment of the language system, which reflects the relevance of the verbalized concept in the national consciousness» [Popova, Sternin 2007, p. 8]. Sacral concept «God» belongs in full to such concepts.

For a long time philosophers, theologians, linguists have tried to explore relevant concepts. New opportunities in this direction appeared in the late twentieth century with the intensification of linguocultural researches and dissemination in the scientific circulation of the category «concept», that covers what the individual knows, supposes, thinks, imagines about objects of the world (R. Pavilionis).

The main lexical unit to denote the concept «God» is word *Бог*. In the scientific picture of the world the concept denoted by the lexeme is defined as «sacral personification of the absolute in religions of the theistic type, which is characterized by the identity of essence and existence» [NFS 2001, p. 110], «the Creator of the